UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/779,306	02/07/2001	Marc Segre	RPS920000029US1	4556

7590 12/22/2003

BRACEWELL & PATTERSON LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
P O BOX 969
AUSTIN, TX 78767

EXAMINER	
SHAPIRO, LEONID	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2673	15

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Mailed

DEC 2 2 2003

Technology Center 2600

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Paper No. 15

Application Number: 09/779,306
Filing Date: February 07, 2001
Appellant(s): SEGRE, MARC

Marc Segre

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 09-17-03.

1. ***Real Party in Interest***

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

2. ***Related Appeals and Interferences***

The brief does not contain a statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief. Therefore, it is presumed that there are none. The Board, however, may exercise its discretion to require an explicit statement as to the existence of any related appeals and interferences.

3. ***Status of Claims***

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

4. ***Status of Amendments After Final***

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

5. ***Summary of Invention***

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

6. ***Issues***

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

7. ***Grouping of Claims***

The rejection of claims 1-3, 6-7, 9, 13-15, 18 stand or fall together because appellant's brief does not include a statement that this grouping of claims does not stand or fall together and reasons in support thereof. See 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7).

8. ***Claims Appealed***

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

9. ***Prior Art of Record***

6,473,101	GRIGOR ET AL.	1-1999
6,266,236	KU ET AL.	6-1999

10. ***Grounds of Rejection***

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-2, 6-7, 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grigor et al. (US Patent No. 6,473,101 B1)

As to claim 1, Grigor et al. teaches a set of data processing systems operating utilizing a single set of input devices comprising: a single set of input devices including a pointing device

(See Fig. 1a, item 30, in description See Col. 3, Lines 4-7); at least two data processing systems (See Fig. 1a, items 16, 20 and 18, 22, in description See from Col. 2, Lines 59 to Col.3, Line 2) sharing the single set of input devices (See Fig. 1a, item 30, in description See Col. 3, Lines 4-7); each data processing system having a display area logically arranged to have at least one boundary in common (See Fig. 5a, items 202, 204, in description See Col. 7, Lines 1-17) with the display area for another data processing system, wherein a pointer driven cursor controlled by the pointing device is located within a logical display area (See Fig. 5a, items 202, 204, in description See Col. 7, Lines 1-17) for an active data processing system receiving input signals from the single set of input devices (See Fig. 1a, item 30, in description See Col.3, Lines 4-7); switching means ((control logic 62) and (controller 72) in Fig. 1b) coupled to single set of input device (See Figs. 1a-1b, item 30, "Position indicator" in description See Col. 3, Lines 4-7) and to each of at least two data processing systems (See Fig. 1a, items 16 and 18, in description See from Col. 2, Lines 59 to Col.3, Line 2), wherein switching means, responsive to the active data processing system signaling movement of the cursor past a common boundary between two display areas, for automatically switching transmission of signals from the single set of input devices from the active data processing system to another data processing system corresponding to a display area sharing the common boundary with the display area for the active data processing system, wherein the other data processing system becomes the active data processing system (See Fig. 5a,b, items 202,204,207, in description See from Col. 6, Line 67 to Col. 7, Line 17 and Fig. 1b, 2b, items 62, 102, 106, in description See Col. 5, Lines 3-27). Operation of "switching means" is described by Grigor in relation to flowchart in Fig. 2b (See Fig. 2b, items 62, 72, 102, 106, in description See Col. 5, 3-27). Grigor shows how (Fig. 1b, control logic 62)

receives position indicator (mouse) data and make decision about crossing common boundary (Fig. 2b, items 100 and 104).

Grigor et al. does not explicitly teaches input controller. However, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have recognize that Gregory et al. multi-view panning system (Fig. 1a, item 10) which receives position data, such as x, y, coordinate data from position indicator (Fig. 1b, item 30) (Se Col. 3, Lines 45-54), the position indicator which is in and provides the selected pan locking data (See Fig. 1b, item 60) to control logic (See Fig. 1b, item 62) (See Col. 4, Lines 12-13) and the control logic (See Fig. 1b, item 62) which outputs control data (Fig. 1b , item 70) to a memory controller (Fig. 1b, item 72) (See Col. 4, Lines 20-21) function the same as Appellant's input controller.

As to claim 7, Grigor et al. teaches a method operating multiple data processing systems using a single set of input devices, (See Fig. 1a, items 16,18,30, in description See Col. 3, Lines 4-25); method comprising: an active data processing system receiving signals from a pointing device within the single set of input devices controlling movement of a cursor within a first logical display area for the active data processing system (See Fig. 5a, items 202, 204, in description See Col. 7, Lines 1-17); responsive to movement of the cursor past a logical common boundary between the first logical display area and a second (See Fig. 5a, items 202, 204, in description See Col. 7, Lines 1-17), logical display area of a inactive data processing system, active data processing system signaling to active data processing system and coupled to the inactive data processing system; and in response to signaling by active data processing system, switching transmission of signals from the single set of input devices from the active data processing system to inactive data processing system, such that the inactive data processing

system becomes the active data processing system and input signals from the single set of input devices control movement of the cursor within the second display area (See Figs. 1b,3b, 5a,b items 30,62,72,116,119,128, in description See Col. 6, Lines 6-25 and from Col. 3, Line 65 to Col. 4, Line 55 and Fig. 1b, 2b, items 62, 102, 106, in description See Col. 5, Lines 3-27). Operation of "switching means" is described by Grigor in relation to flowchart in Fig. 2b (See Fig. 2b, items 62, 72, 102, 106, in description See Col. 5, 3-27).

Grigor et al. does not explicitly teaches input controller. However, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have recognize that Gregory et al. multi-view panning system (Fig. 1a, item 10) which receives position data, such as x, y, coordinate data from position indicator (Fig. 1b, item 30) (Se Col. 3, Lines 45-54), the position indicator which is in and provides the selected pan locking data (See Fig. 1b, item 60) to control logic (See Fig. 1b, item 62) (See Col. 4, Lines 12-13) and the control logic (See Fig. 1b, item 62) which outputs control data (Fig. 1b , item 70) to a memory controller (Fig. 1b, item 72) (See Col. 4, Lines 20-21) function the same as Appellant's input controller.

As to claim 15, Grigor et al. teaches an automatic input switching device comprising: a controller; an input connection within the controller for a single set of input devices including a pointing device (See Fig. 1a, item 30, in description See Col. 3, Lines 4-7); output connections within for at least two data processing systems; switching logic within at least two data processing systems transmitting input signals from the single set of input devices to an active data processing system (See Fig. 1a,b, items 62,72 30, in description See from Col. 2, Line 59 to Col. 4, Line 55); wherein the switching logic (See Fig. 1b, items 62, 72), responsive to receipt of signaling from the active data processing system indicative of movement of the cursor

past a logical common boundary between the display area of the active data processing system and a logical display area for another data processing system (See Fig. 5a, items 202, 204, in description See Col. 7, Lines 1-17), automatically switching transmission of signals from the single set of input devices from the active data processing system to another data processing system, wherein another data processing system becomes the active data processing system (See Figs. 1b,3b, 5a,b items 30,62,72,116,119,128, in description See Col. 6, Lines 36-25 and from Col. 3, Line 65 to Col. 4, Line 55). Operation of "switching means" is described by Grigor in relation to flowchart in Fig. 2b (See Fig. 2b, items 62, 72, 102, 106, in description See Col. 5, 3-27).

Grigor et al. does not explicitly teaches input controller. However, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have recognize that Gregory et al. multi-view panning system (Fig. 1a, item 10) which receives position data, such as x, y, coordinate data from position indicator (Fig. 1b, item 30) (Se Col. 3, Lines 45-54), the position indicator which is in and provides the selected pan locking data (See Fig. 1b, item 60) to control logic (See Fig. 1b, item 62) (See Col. 4, Lines 12-13) and the control logic (See Fig. 1b, item 62) which outputs control data (Fig. 1b , item 70) to a memory controller (Fig. 1b, item 72) (See Col. 4, Lines 20-21) function the same as Appellant's input controller.

As to claim 2, Grigor et al. teaches a set of data processing systems, wherein the at least two data processing systems with an array of data processing system displays, each data processing system display corresponding to a different data processing system having a logical display area (See Fig. 1a, items 16,18,20,22 in description See from Col. 2, Line 59 to Col. 3, Line 25 and Fig. 5a, items 202, 204, in description See Col. 7, Lines 1-17).

As to claims 6,13-14, Grigor et al. teaches a set of data processing systems with a logical arrangement of display areas for at least two data processing systems which corresponds to a physical configuration of display devices for the at least two data processing systems, wherein logical display areas for data processing systems having physically adjacent display devices share a logical common boundary (See Fig. 5a, items 202, 204, in description See Col. 7, Lines 1-17).

2. Claims 3, 9, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grigor et al. as aforementioned in claims 1,7,15 in view of Ku et al. (US Patent No. 6,266,236 B1).

Grigor et al. does not show a universal serial bus (USB) connection of a single set of input devices to each data processing system.

As to claims 3, 9, 18, Ku et al. teaches a keyboard and a mouse connection using a universal serial bus (See Fig. 1, items 10, 26, in description see Col. 8, Lines 12-21).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use a USB for mouse and keyboard connections as taught by Ku et al. into the device of Grigor et al., since this will provide computer system which is lightweight and convenient to transport (See Col. 12, Lines 66-67 in the Ku et al. reference).

11. *Response to Argument*

On Page 5, Line 29 to Page 6, Line 17, Appellant argues, that Grigor does not teaching "switching means". Examiner disagrees with Appellants argument. The claim recites: "switching means including an input controller coupled to said single input device and to each of

said at least two data processing system". Grigor et al. clearly teaches a switching means ((control logic 62) and (controller 72) in Fig. 1b) including an input controller (See Fig. 1b, items 62, 72) coupled to single set of input device (See Figs. 1a-1b, item 30, "Position indicator" in description See Col. 3, Lines 4-7) and to each of at least two data processing systems (See Fig. 1a, items 16 and 18, in description See from Col. 2, Lines 59 to Col.3, Line 2).

Therefore, Grigor et al. clearly teaches "switching means" the same as Appellant's claimed invention.

On page 6, 3rd paragraph Appellant recognized that Grigor **clearly** teaches panning a mouse between multiple displays and that many processing devices implemented by Grigor. However, Grigor also teaches technique for switching of input device signals as discussed above.

For the above reasons, it is believed that that rejection should be sustain.

Respectfully submitted,

ls
December 19, 2003

Conferees:

Leon Shapiro

Bipin Shalwala

BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Amare Mengistu

Amare Mengistu
Primary Examiner

BRACEWELL & PATTERSON LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
P O BOX 969
AUSTIN, TX 78767